

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF *CYPSELUS*
ABESSYNICUS STREUBEL, 1848 (AVES). Z.N.(S.) 1914
(see volume 27, pages 253-254)

By Charles White (*Lytham St. Annes, England*)

I strongly support the proposals contained in this application. The shift in application of the name *abessynicus* would entail precisely the kind of change which is most undesirable. Moreover, whilst *abessynicus* was applied to the African birds now renamed *aerobates*, it has often been remarked that despite disjunct ranges, *Apus affinis abessynicus* was a poorly marked subspecies which could be united with the nominate *affinis*. The shift of name to a different and valid subspecies (not normally questioned as valid) would be doubly confusing when the literature contains numerous expressions of doubt as to whether *abessynicus* (as long used) reflects a valid subspecies.

COMMENT ON PROPOSALS CONCERNING *ORTHO CERAS* BRUGUIÈRE,
1789 (CEPHALOPODA). Z.N.(S.) 44
(see volume 27, pages 180-193)

By Curt Teichert (*Department of Geology, University of Kansas, Lawrence,
Kansas 66044*)

Bernhard Kummel has recently sent me a copy of R. V. Melville's application regarding *Orthoceras* Bruguière, published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, December 1970, and he has asked me to refresh my memory on matters with which I was much involved in the mid-1930's and again in the late 1950's when Mr. Melville prepared his previous report to the ICZN on this case. I shall address myself first to Part I of Mr. Melville's proposal as stated on page 185 of his article.

In the light of the *Code* that is presently in force, I fail to see that we have any problem here whatsoever. Article 69(a)(ii) provides that "if no nominal species were included at the time the genus was established, the nominal species-group taxa that were first subsequently and expressly referred to it are to be treated as the only originally included species". It is true that after Bruguière in 1789 had established the genus *Orthoceras*, many authors used this generic name which became a household word in paleontology. But as far as I am aware, nobody before Miller, Dunbar, and Condra (1933) had ever specifically attributed this genus to Bruguière, and they were certainly the first to designate a type species for this genus, namely *Orthoceras regularis* Schlotheim. This choice of type species must stand and is not subject to challenge. However, if it is felt that the Commission should rule on this case in order to insure continuity and stability in nomenclature, I strongly support Mr. Melville's suggestion as proposed in the first alternative under Part I on page 185.

I further support entirely and completely all proposals made in Part II of Mr. Melville's application on pages 185-186. Action is long overdue to bury once and for all the ancient names mentioned in this Part. Paleontologists' time nowadays is far too valuable to be squandered on petty quibbles and legalisms. By adopting the suggestions offered in Part II of Mr. Melville's application, the Commission will dispose of a lot of nomenclatural garbage that should never have been allowed to clutter up scientific literature for so long.